

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,509	06/13/2005	Herman Jan Tijimen Coelingh Bennink	0470-045922	1291
	7590 12/07/200 AW FIRM, P.C.	9	EXAM	IINER
700 KOPPERS BUILDING			JEAN-LOUIS, SAMIRA JM	
436 SEVENTE PITTSBURGH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/517,509 COELINGH BENNINK ET AL. Examiner Art Unit

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS. (3) Thomas Wolski (4)			7	ĺ
(1) SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS. (3) Thomas Wolski. (2) Sreeni Padmanabhan. (4) Date of Interview: 02 December 2009. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c] ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 28. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically, Attorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Esteriol (is. £4) and that prior to applicant's into the presentation, the Examiners sudgested that applicant deletes the line dealing the precursors of £4 as well as the term "reducing the risk of". While applicant insists that support is found in the specification, SPE Padmanabhan stated that in light of the teaching of the specification, reducing the risk equates to prevention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski will consider the Examiners' recommendation and will respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that		SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS	1627	
(2) Sreeni Padmanabhan. (4)	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
Date of Interview: 02 December 2009. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 28. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically. Attorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Estetrol (is. E4 and that prior to applicant's intention, others in the field had practically abandoned research on E4 as it was proposed that E4 was a low estrogenic compound. Subsequent to the presentation, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing with precursors of E4 as well as the term "reducing the risk of". While applicant insist hat support is found in the specification. SPE Padmanabhan stated that in light of the teaching of the specification, reducing the risk equales to prevention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski will consider the Examiners greed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRI	(1) <u>SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS</u> .	(3)Thomas Wolski.		
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 28. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically, Attorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Esteriol (i.e. £4) and that prior to applicant's into the first applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Esteriol (i.e. £4) and that prior to applicant's into the first entition, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing intercursors of £4 as well as the term 'reducing the risk of'. While applicant insists that support is found in the specification. SPE Padmanabhan stated that in light of the leaching of the specification, reducing the risk equates to prevention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski will consider the Examiners' recommendation and will respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the	(2) <u>Sreeni Padmanabhan</u> .	(4)		
c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 28. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically, Attorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Estetrol (is. £4 and that prior to applicant's into the first half-life of Estetrol (is. £4 and that prior to applicant's introduction, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing intercursors of £4 as well as the term "reducing the risk of". While applicant insists that support is found in the specification, SPE Padmanbhan stated that in light of the teaching of the specification, reducing the risk equales to prevention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski will consider the Examiners' recommendation and will respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF THIS INTERVIEW SUBMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUBMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. SubmMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, T	Date of Interview: <u>02 December 2009</u> .			
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 28. Identification of prior art discussed: Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Altorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically. Altorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Estetrol (i.e. £4) and that prior to applicant's invention, others in the field had practically abandoned research on £4 as it was proposed that £4 was a low estrogenic compound. Subsequent to the presentation, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing with precursors of £4 as well as the term 'reducing the risk of'. While applicant insists that support is found in the specification. SPE Padmanabhan stated that in light of the teaching of the specification, reducing the risk equates to prevention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Altorney Wolski will consider the Examiners' recommendation and will respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. The properties of the properties of the properties of the properties. The properties of the properties. The properties of th		2) applicant's representative	e]	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically, Attorney Wolski opined out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Estetrol (i.e. E4) and that prior to applicant's invention, others in the field had practically abandoned research on E4 as it was proposed that E4 was a low estrogenic compound. Subsequent to the presentation, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing with precursors of E4 as well as the term "reducing the risk of". While applicant insists that support is found in the specification, SPE Padmanabhan stated that in light of the teaching of the specification, reducing the risk equates to revention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski will consider the Examiners' recommendation and will respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. Sues Summary of Record of Interview		e) □ No.		
Agreement with respect to the claims fi was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically, Attorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Estetrol (i.e. E4) and that prior to applicant's invention, others in the field had practically abandoned research on E4 as it was proposed that E4 was a low estrogenic compound. Subsequent to the presentation, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing with precursors of E4 as well as the term "reducing the risk of". While applicant insists that support is found in the specification, SPE Padmanabhan stated that in light of the teaching of the specification, reducing the risk equates to revention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski will consider the Examiners' recommendation and will respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claim allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview	Claim(s) discussed: 28.			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <a (a="" (see="" 713.04).="" a="" accordingly.="" action="" agreed="" allowable="" allowable,="" already="" also,="" amendments="" and="" applicant="" as="" attached.="" attached.)="" attorney="" available,="" be="" been="" claim="" claims="" consider="" copy="" could="" days="" description,="" enablement="" ensue.="" equates="" examiner="" examiners'="" flied,="" form,="" formal="" found="" from="" fuller="" given="" has="" href="Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some beckground information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically, Attorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Estetrol (i.e. E4) and that prior to applicant's invention, others in the field had practically abandoned research on E4 as it was proposed that E4 was a low estrogenic compound. Subsequent to the presentation, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing with precursors of E4 as well as the term 'reducing the risk of'. While applicant insists that support is found in the specification. SPE Padmanabhan stated that in light of the teaching of the specification, reducing the risk equates to prevention. As a result, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski will consider the Examiners' recommendation and will respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview</td><td>Identification of prior art discussed:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>reached, or any other comments: Attorney Wolski wanted to give the Examiners some background information and provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution of the case. Specifically, Attorney Wolski pointed out that applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Esterto I.e. E41 and that prior to applicant's invention, others in the field had practically abandoned research on E4 as it was proposed that E4 was a low estrogenic compound. Subsequent to the presentation, the Examiners suggested that applicant deletes the line dealing hyrecursors of E4 as well as the term " if="" in="" include="" insists="" interview="" interview.="" interview<="" is="" issues="" last="" later,="" light="" longer="" month="" mpep="" must="" necessary,="" no="" non-extendable="" of="" of".="" office="" one="" or="" padmanabhan="" period="" recommendation="" record="" reducing="" render="" reply="" respond="" result,="" revention.="" risk="" section="" spe="" specification,="" stated="" statement="" subsequence="" substance="" summary="" support="" td="" teaching="" tfile="" that="" the="" thereof="" thirty="" this="" to="" where="" which="" whichever="" while="" will="" wolski="" would="" written=""><td>Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g</td><td>g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N</td><td>I/A.</td><td></td>	Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g	g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
/Samira Jean-Louis/ Examiner, Art Unit 1627	reached, or any other comments: Attornev Wolski wanted provide some arguments in order to advance prosecution: applicant is the first to discover the high half-life of Estetroi the field had practically abandoned research on £4 as it were subsequent to the presentation. The Examiners suggested £4 as well as the term "reducing the risk of". While applica Padmanabhan stated that in light of the teaching of the spresult, enablement issues could ensue. Attorney Wolski w respond accordingly. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amena allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE. OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTITLE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTE	to give the Examiners some but the case. Specifically, Attor (i.e. E4) and that prior to appl as proposed that E4 was a low that applicant deletes the line and insists that support is found selfication, reducing the risk et ill consider the Examiners' recurrence of the support of the amendments that w.d.) ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE Last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, RVIEW. See Summary of Re	ackground inform nery Wolski point leant's invention, e strogenic com dealing with pre- d in the specifical guates to preveni ommendation are reed would render ould render the E SUBSTANCE (been filed, APP Y DAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS	nation and ed out that out tha

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-of-Jace, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application where or not an agreement with the examiner was rescated at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant of the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal Interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate. the Form should be mailed ormountly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the interview Summay Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

- A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the
- Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully
 - describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.